

E.B.C. MONITORING SERVICE AND F.B.I.S.

10th April, 1948.

R.M.S. Copies to H.E.U., Senior Editor (Reports), Editor, News Bureau.

Attached herewith is the Report on the E.B.C. Monitoring Service & F.B.I.S.

The following factors have been examined:

The relationship between the E.B.C. Monitoring Service and the Central Intelligence Agency.

The coordination of the Cairo-Caversham effort.

The machinery for the joint direction of the Cairo-Caversham effort.

F.B.I.S. Cairo coverage.

The quality of Cairo monitoring.

The quality of material monitored at Cairo.

The time lag between Cairo and Caversham.

F.B.I.S. Far Eastern and Latin American material received in Washington.

The contents of the Appendices are:

Appendix A An analysis of Cairo coverage in comparison with Caversham coverage for the same area.

Appendix B Detailed tables of Cairo-Caversham time lag (1 copy only).

Appendix C Comparative analysis of Far Eastern transmissions (from 48-hour Washington file).

Appendix D Comparative analysis of Latin American transmissions (from 48-hour Washington file).

Appendix E F.B.I.S. Far Eastern coverage (from 48-hour Washington file).

Appendix F F.B.I.S. Latin American coverage (from 48-hour Washington file).

STAT

CK/BH

B.B.C. MONITORING SERVICE AND F.B.I.S.

Relationship Between the B.B.C. Monitoring Service and the
Central Intelligence Agency

During the war the B.B.C., at the request of H.M.S., made the products of the Monitoring Service available to two American Governmental Agencies - namely the Office of War Information and the Federal Communications Commission. There was no comparable reciprocity from either agency. Although material from O.W.I. and F.C.C. sources was made available, it was only of very limited value. As a result of developments since the war now taking in the U.S. is now controlled by the Central Intelligence Agency, and comprises one of the activities of the "Office of Operations" of that Agency entitled Foreign Broadcast Information Service (F.B.I.S.).

Such U.S. material as had been available during the war passed entirely for some time, though U.S. requirements as represented by C.I.A. continued to be met through F.B.I.S. representation at Gaverham, where they have access to all material and enjoy all the facilities of the service including accommodation. At the end of 1946, F.B.I.S. took over the Cairo Monitoring Service from British control, but it was not until April, 1947 that all necessary arrangements had been made for material monitored in Cairo to be cabled to the B.B.C. Monitoring Service. As no charge is made on the U.S. Government for the receipt of the B.B.C. monitored material, similarly no charge was made on the B.B.C. for the products of the Cairo Monitoring Service.

Meanwhile, negotiations were on train for the transfer of the F.B.I.S. Cairo unit to Cyprus, owing, mainly, to local difficulties arising out of the Egyptian attitude. Approval was given finally in August 1947 for the U.S., subject to certain security qualifications, to erect and maintain a Monitoring Unit in the island. H.M.S. and General Albert, (Head of Operations Office C.I.A.), visited Cyprus at the end of 1947 to examine the situation locally. The project is now in the process of implementation, and it is estimated that the Service will be in operation towards the end of 1948.

With the consent of H.M.S., the B.B.C. signed an agreement with C.I.A. whereby: (a) F.B.I.S. will select up to 20,000 words a day from material intercepted from their monitoring stations covering the Far East and Latin America, and transmit this to Gaverham without cost to the B.B.C. The selection to be in accordance with broad B.B.C. directives. F.B.I.S. will provide the personnel for this selection free of cost unless the B.B.C. at any time wish to provide its own personnel for this purpose.

(b) F.B.I.S. will send up to a maximum average of 10,000 words a day of material selected from its Cyprus coverage of Russia, Balkan and Middle Eastern transmitters of mutual interest to F.B.I.S. Washington and B.B.C. Gaverham. The cost of transmission of this material to be borne by the B.B.C.

Note: This would amount to about £15,000 per annum.

(c) The B.B.C. will continue to make available to F.B.I.S. at Gaverham the product of all the material intercepted by the B.B.C. Monitoring Service.

(d) If either organization wishes to alter or terminate the agreement, a minimum of 90 days' notice should be given.

- 2 -

The B.B.C. Monitoring Service have not yet called on F.B.I.S. for the agreed daily cabled 20,000 words of Far Eastern-Latin American material, though F.B.I.S. have made available to the Monitoring Service sample copies of their Washington Daily Reports, and have provided a specimen 24-hour intake of Far Eastern and Latin American material. This has enabled an examination of the type, coverage, and quality of this material to be made.

Following certain reorganization of the B.B.C. Overseas Services, and the development of Governmental machinery for the coordination of ministerial interests in and the provision of guidance to the Monitoring Service, H.M.S. addressed a letter to General Sibert in February, 1948, referring to these developments. Proposals were made for annual or bi-annual discussions between the Monitoring Service and C.I.A. It was suggested that the time was now ripe for the consideration of a number of questions of mutual interest and policy in order that the activities of the British and U.S. monitoring organisations could be coordinated in such a manner as to meet the requirements of their respective consumers and of each other's interests in the most economical and efficient way.

As it was understood that Colonel White, Head of F.B.I.S. Washington, was expected to be visiting the U.K. in the spring, it was suggested that preliminary discussions might take place with him followed by a meeting with General Sibert himself.

Simultaneously, the General addressed a letter to H.M.S. also expressing the desirability for a conference on U.S. and British monitoring coverage, and suggesting that the first meeting should take place in Washington in May.

H.M.S.'s and General Sibert's letters having crossed in the post, there were no further developments until information was received that Colonel White was expected to arrive in U.K. on 11th April. He is expected to leave for Cairo on 17th April and has asked H.M.S. to accompany him. Mr. G. Carey, Deputy Head of Operations Office of C.I.A. is expected to arrive in U.K. about 10th May, by which date Colonel White should have returned to U.K. from his Cairo visit.

Summary

- (a) F.B.I.S. receive all B.B.C. monitored material free.
- (b) B.B.C. receive selected F.B.I.S. monitored material from Cairo free, and will receive similar material from Cyprus when F.B.I.S. move there for which they will pay transmission costs of about £15,000 per annum.
- (c) F.B.I.S. Washington will send free to the B.B.C. 20,000 words daily of selected material from their Far Eastern and Latin American intercepts. The Monitoring Service have not yet called on F.B.I.S. to provide this service, though specimens of the material have been provided for examination.
- (d) It has been proposed both by the B.B.C. and F.B.I.S. that conferences should take place to discuss the coordination of coverage and other matters of mutual interest, in order that their joint activities should meet the requirements of each other and of their respective consumers in the most satisfactory manner.
- (e) Head of F.B.I.S. is expected in U.K. on 11th April.
- (f) Mr. Carey of C.I.A. Office of Operations is expected in U.K. about 10th May.

Notes: Specialised aspects of the relationship between C.I.A., B.B.C. Monitoring Service and certain U.S. and British Governmental organisations are included in a separate secret memorandum.

COORDINATION OF THE CAVERSHAM-CAIRO EFFORT

Introduction

F.B.I.S. took over the Cairo Monitoring Service from British control at the end of 1945. Thereafter, satisfactory arrangements for the receipt of material from this source at Caversham were not made until April, 1947, when B.G. (and later the Treasury), approved the necessary expenditure for the rental of a teleprinter to connect with the American circuit which was already in operation. Since then, material monitored by F.B.I.S. Cairo has been available to B.B.C. Caversham. This was the first step taken towards any coordination of effort between the two services.

STAT

2. In April, 1947, Mr. Russell Shepherd (Head of F.B.I.S.) and [redacted] (Head of the Cairo Unit) visited U.K. and, as a result of discussions with the B.B.C. Monitoring Service, a letter was addressed to Mr. Hall which included lists showing:

(a) Transmissions monitored by Cairo which are covered at Caversham and which, consequently, give duplication.
Note: In further discussion it emerged that in some instances duplication was not complete and the necessary amendments were made.

(b) Transmissions which could not, for various reasons, be covered basically at Caversham and which Cairo was requested to cover as far as possible.

(c) Transmissions which, owing to seasonal changes in reception, could not be covered at Caversham and which we would like Cairo to cover as far as possible. Alterations to this category would arise and information on this subject would be exchanged.

3. It was stated that traffic on such material as was required would vary according to interest and other factors, while it was understood that the traffic would be limited to the wordage finally agreed.

4. Details of deviation from Cairo basic schedule were invited.

5. This letter to Mr. Hall is virtually the nucleus from which any Cairo-Caversham coordination has emerged.

6. **The Present Situation**

Coordination of effort between Caversham and Cairo as it exists today has not developed in any marked degree, and may be described as being somewhat loose and informal.

In general terms, it falls within the undermentioned limitations:

(i) A periodic exchange of lists of broadcasts monitored by the respective services.

(ii) Ad hoc requests from Caversham for coverage of specific bulletins and technical information.

(iii) Occasional requests from Caversham for fuller texts of material already received.

7. There has been no attempt to review the whole potential field of coverage of the two services as a single problem, and to allocate tasks on this basis. Cairo never makes reverse requests to Caversham for specific coverage tasks, nor is there any immediate mutual interchange of alterations

in the respective coverage schedules of the two stations. Duplication continues to exist, while little or no effort is made for its elimination or for the development of the overall resources to better effect.

8. It appears, furthermore, that no steps are taken in Washington to review the combined output from Caversham and Cairo as complementary products, nor are any proposals forthcoming from this quarter as to how the available resources of the two services can be employed to greater advantage.

9. Reasons for the Existing Situation

It is suggested that the main reasons for the existing state of affairs are as follows:

- (i) When the Cairo material was first made available to the B.B.C. in April, 1947, the problem of coverage was not viewed from a joint approach, a detailed machinery for a continuous coordination of effort was not prepared on an agreed and formal basis.
- (ii) As a result of experience gained in the course of time, Caversham were deliberately prepared to accept duplications because:
 - (a) The standard of material received from Cairo is not always acceptable.
 - (b) The time lag in the receipt of the material was frequently so big that the value of the material when received had been largely discounted.
- (iii) Washington does not appear to have taken any steps to improve the quality of the Cairo output, or to minimise the time lag in transmission. The latter omission may be due to the existence of insurmountable obstacles in Cairo in the form of local obstruction, and to the fact that the material is used in G.I.A. on a long term basis and does not have the "news" requirement of the B.B.C.

Recommendations for the Future

10. The projected move of the Cairo Service to Cyprus presents a suitable opportunity for taking steps to improve the coordination of effort in the future.

It is suggested that these should include:

- (i) Arrangements for a continuous and inter-related direction and coordination of coverage, and selection to meet joint requirements. It would appear that such coordination could be carried out more suitably from Caversham under joint B.B.C.-F.B.I.S. control, than elsewhere.
- (ii) Agreement on standards of material, together with necessary steps to obtain and maintain such standards. This may mean that British Editorial and News Bureau representation will be required at Cyprus.
- (iii) The time factor in transmission of material from Cyprus to Caversham should be carefully examined, and the necessary action taken to ensure that this be reduced to a minimum.

MACHINERY FOR THE JOINT DIRECTION OF THE

CAVERHAM-CAIRO EFFORT

It will be seen from the foregoing remarks on coordination that no machinery exists for the joint direction of the Caversham-Cairo effort.

It is suggested that joint "direction" might lead to a rather too rigid type of machinery as Washington might wish to take a direct part in such machinery, and this might well lead to inconvenient delays in obtaining decisions on action to be taken.

It would appear that mutual interests are likely to be best served by the Monitoring Service and F.R.I.S. representatives at Caversham working in cooperation to coordinate the Caversham-Cairo (and later Cyprus) coverage to the best advantage in order to fulfill the requirements of broad directives given to them by E.M.S. and C.I.A. respectively.

F.B.I. CAIRO COVERAGE

Broadcasts from Athens, Salonica and Tirana are of the utmost importance to the Monitoring Service owing to reception conditions. The value of the Cairo coverage of Athens has, however, been reduced since the introduction of short-wave relays of certain home service bulletins and of short-wave transmissions in foreign languages. Soviet regional stations and various Near and Middle East broadcasts on the Cairo list are also of great value.

Rumanian and Bulgarian transmissions, though frequently monitored by Caversham, must also be covered in Cairo as reception conditions here are too unreliable for regular and full transcription.

There is a considerable number of transmissions covered by both Caversham and Cairo.

Cairo covers a number of transmissions which we do not consider of sufficient interest for coverage here.

Cairo covers Albanian and Ukrainian bulletins, certain of which are audible at Caversham, but for which we do not have the necessary language monitors.

The Cairo specimen 48-hour file and, to an even greater extent, the cabled material, only represents a proportion of the bulletins on the Regular List.

A detailed analysis of the Cairo coverage compared with Caversham coverage over the same area is given in Appendix A.

Comparison of Cairo Regular List with Two-Day File of Cairo Monitoring

The two-day file of Cairo monitoring was in itself rather misleading as it contained material carried on three days - 26th, 27th and 28th January (also from one bulletin of 25th).

The Cairo Regular List contains 106 bulletins.

The bulletins in the two-day file were as follows:

25th January	1
26th "	30
27th "	61
28th "	32
	<u>124</u>

Bulletins covered but not on Regular List	<u>13</u>
	<u>137</u>

Thus for a daily average of 62 bulletins from the Regular List were transcribed or about 58 per cent of those on the List.

Material from 49 of the 137 bulletins was received by cable.

QUALITY OF CAIRO MONITORING

Bulgarian, Serbo-Croat and Rumanian

Material from Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Rumania would appear to be competently monitored. The copies of bulletins which received seem to be all sub-edited but it was clear that the broadcasts had been listened to by people who had considerable background knowledge.

Russian and Ukrainian

Transcripts of broadcasts from Kiev in Ukrainian and from a number of Soviet provincial stations in Russian are weak, both as regards selection and monitoring technique. The main weakness lies in the fact that material from these stations seems to be entirely uncoordinated with that broadcast from Moscow. There is no point, for example, in monitoring from Kiev in Ukrainian on 22/1/48 the translation of a speech which Stalov, the Head of the Communist Party Propaganda Department, broadcast from Moscow the previous day. The Kiev version - probably poorly received - was incomplete, scrappy and unsatisfactory in every way. Ukrainian and Russian monitors in Cairo would appear to suffer very much from the lack of reference material without which no proper monitoring can be done. Nor do they seem to be in a position to acquire any substantial background knowledge which can be best done either by listening to Moscow or through a careful study of the Soviet Press. Most of the names that occur in the transcripts - except the most elementary ones - are incorrect.

A number of items monitored from the Soviet provincial stations are so scrappy that they hardly make sense. The monitors' knowledge of the language seems to be undeveloped and they would appear to be unfamiliar with some of the most common expressions used in the Soviet "production slang". Thus "Stornovitya" is not just a word "derived from the word storm" - as the Cairo monitor put it - but means "shock workers", i.e. particularly efficient workers dealing with specially difficult tasks - on the analogy of "shock troops".

On the whole one has the impression that the Russian and Ukrainian monitors in Cairo lack background knowledge, reference material and political instinct and that their monitoring is purely phonetic, which - as we have seen here so often - can never produce satisfactory results.

Broadcast in Arabic

The translations of material in Arabic are good and broadcasts from stations in the Middle East would appear to be competently handled. It may be pointed out that in monitoring transmissions from Sharq Al-Adna, Cairo staff seem to be guided by principles of selection entirely different from those followed at Caversham. Sharq Al-Adna broadcasts are dealt with very fully in Cairo and the transcripts often include items which are dismissed here as being of no interest.

As far as the Moscow broadcasts in Arabic are concerned, the standard of monitoring in Cairo is less good. In order to handle Moscow broadcasts efficiently a considerable amount of general - in addition to specialized background - is essential, and a certain lack of such background is definitely revealed in Cairo transcripts. To quote one example: The Cairo Daily Monitoring Report of 9/2/48 in its version of a Moscow talk broadcast in Arabic at 17.00 G.M.T. gives the names of the two Jewish immigrant ships as "Fanny York" and "Ben Christian"; the correct names are of course "Pan York" and "Pan Crescent".

Broadcasts in Greek

Translations of material broadcast in Greek are on the whole good. Transmissions from Athens, Belgrade and, especially, Moscow would appear to be treated fully and competently. Not knowing the reception conditions in Cairo, it is impossible to ascertain the reasons for a number of gaps and queried words in the transcripts of material broadcast from Athens, but, generally speaking, the Greek monitoring in Cairo would seem to be based on very sound background knowledge.

Broadcasts in Turkish

The Cairo transcription of broadcasts in Turkish seems to be much more superficial than in Caversham. Edited transcripts read well. The English in the unedited material is sometimes very uneven.

Broadcasts in English

The standard of monitoring of these broadcasts is the least satisfactory of all. Two English bulletins have been covered regularly in Cairo, namely the 18.00 Tashkent broadcast (three times weekly) and the 17.30 Athens transmission. Some of these transcripts have been checked against records at Caversham and a number of shortcomings noted. The Tashkent broadcast of the 11th January contained some quite wrong - yet unqueried - names, mishearings, gaps and distortions. For example, the Farhad Power Station in Soviet Central Asia was apparently unknown to the staff in Cairo: it was missed in the transcript, which naturally rendered the item in question completely valueless.

Another example of rather unsatisfactory monitoring was provided by the cabled version of the Greek communique given in the 17.30 Athens broadcast of 6th April, which was also monitored here. Below is a comparison of the two versions:

<u>Cairo Version</u>	<u>Caversham Version</u>
Shelled areas	Shelled two passing trains
in Doiran	in the Mikrovrissi-Doiran area
Stavros village	Stavros village (Khalkidhiki)
wounded many more in the area	seven wounded near the border in the area
several killed	seven killed

It may be added that the task of the English monitor is particularly difficult. The very nature of their work demands that they should deal with numerous countries and they cannot be reasonably expected to have any good background knowledge in each single case. In Caversham this difficulty is overcome through an intensive training in the use of reference material and, which is most important, through close cooperation and consultation with the relevant foreign language teams. Thus here an English monitor dealing with a broadcast in English from Persia would invariably consult a Persian expert on names, background etc. Judging by our experience, this is the only way to achieve satisfactory results. From the English transcripts that have reached us this system would not appear to be in force in Cairo.

Conclusions:

(a) The Cairo monitoring of broadcasts in Bulgarian, Greek, Rumanian and Serbo-Croat can be considered satisfactory from our point of view.

(b) The monitoring of Arabic broadcasts from stations in the Middle East is satisfactory. The standard of transcripts of Arabic material from Moscow is inferior to ours.

(c) We would welcome much greater thoroughness in the transcription of broadcasts in Turkish.

(d) The standard of the monitoring of broadcasts in Russian, Ukrainian and English is so low that it can be fairly described as unacceptable to Caversham.

(e) The main difference between Cairo and Caversham monitoring would appear to lie in the approach: Cairo monitoring seems to be "phonetic"; i.e. monitors seem to put down what they think they hear and seem to lack the facilities and the technique of establishing whether their phonetic impression corresponds to what has actually been said at the other end.

QUALITY OF MATERIAL MONITORED AT CAIRO

A comparative examination of material monitored and transcribed in Cairo and Caversham over a 48-hour period, and the relevant cable output and Cairo daily edited reports reveal certain factors.

In general, the quality of material monitored at Cairo is uneven, and varies both from language to language and from day to day.

Comments on the different language groups are given in the following paragraphs:

Balkan Languages

Broadcasts in Greek and Bulgarian are usually dealt with very adequately, the Athens home service being particularly valuable, though to a somewhat lesser degree since the installation of the new short-wave transmitter. Serbo-Croat is very good, and the point is made that Belgrade is generally more fully monitored by Cairo than by Caversham.

Consistency in Cairo's handling of Balkan material does, however, appear to be lacking. Transcriptions sometimes are fuller than those at Caversham, sometimes the reverse. As reception from the countries concerned should always be better in Cairo than at Caversham, reasons for this unevenness are not apparent.

While nearly all material in the transcripts, much of which was also cabled, appear to have been covered by Caversham monitoring, the following exceptions were noted:

(a) A most serious omission was the announcement, not obtained from any other source, on 27th February in the Belgrade home news of two promotions to the rank of Major-General. This was transcribed, but not teleprinted nor given in the Cairo Report.

(b) An interesting propaganda talk from Bucharest at 12.30 on 26th February designed to counteract popular resentment against the census in Rumania was not cabled.

(c) Names of representatives of Turkish, Gypsy and Jewish minorities collaborating with the Bulgarian regime, together with numerical details concerning the minorities, were not cabled. (Sofia, 13.30, 27.1.48)

Russian

Cairo's Russian monitoring is most unsatisfactory, judged by B.B.C. standards, and the results received at Caversham are regarded as too dangerous for use in the Summary. There appears to be little understanding of the Russian background and selection is haphazard. As a single example, amongst many others, Stalov's Lenin Anniversary speech, which had been fully broadcast by Moscow in Russian and several other languages on 21st January, was cabled to Caversham translated from the Ukrainian (Kiev) on 23rd January.

From Soviet Regional stations, an examination of Cairo transcripts of 27th and 28th January showed that of four separate broadcasts only the texts of one, a Stalin letter, and a single news item from another, were cabled. Both were used virtually in full in the Cairo Report, which also included facts from two additional broadcasts on 28th January of which we received no transcripts. The remaining two broadcasts, of which there were flinches, did not appear to have been used either in the cables or the Cairo report. These contained certain information which would have been useful to our consumers.

English

The standard of English monitoring, particularly of Tashkent, is very low.

Arabic

Broadcasts in this language are generally dealt with very adequately, and use is made of this material in Part III of the Summary where it is regarded as of value.

Palestine

Use is made of material from Hagana and Jewish clandestine stations which are not audible in Caversham.

Conclusions

- (a) Only a proportion of material transcribed in Cairo is cabled.
- (b) Only a proportion of material transcribed is used in the Cairo Daily Report.
- (c) The items cabled and those included in ~~the~~ the Cairo Daily Report are evidently selected from different angles. It is not, however, clear in either case what method of selection is employed.
- (d) A high percentage of duplication of Caversham monitoring is to be found in cabled material and in the Cairo Daily Report.
- (e) Certain material of intelligence and information value to our consumers is not cabled, but appears in the Cairo Report. Other such material is transcribed but not either cabled or used in the Cairo Report.
- (f) There is little sign of consistent sub-editing of cabled material, which in nearly all cases is sent as transcribed.
- (g) There appears to be a certain if limited and not always intelligent attempt at sub-editing of material in the Cairo report. By B.S.G. standards the editing and arrangement of the Report would appear to be haphazard.

ANALYSIS OF TIME LAG FACTOR IN F.B.I.S. CAIRO

CABLE SERVICE TO F.B.I.S. CAVERSHAM

An analysis of the time lag on 115 items received from Cairo between 17th January 1948 and 2nd March 1948 has been carried out. The time lag has been divided into two categories:

- (a) The time of broadcast to the time of despatch from the Cairo cable office.
- (b) The time of despatch from the Cairo cable office to the time of receipt in the Caversham News Bureau.

2. The average time lag in the two categories above is:

- (a) 15 hours.
- (b) 3 hours 10 minutes.

The average overall interval from the time of broadcast to the time of receipt in Caversham is therefore 18 hours 10 minutes.

3. The best result achieved under category 1(a) above was 2 hours, and the worst 58 hours 40 minutes. The best result achieved under category (b) was one hour.

4. The average time lag of 18 hours 10 minutes from time of broadcast to time of receipt in Caversham News Bureau makes the service practically valueless from the news point of view, though this factor is less important from the Editorial publications aspect.

5. It is clear that the major component of the total lag is the delay between time of broadcast and time of dispatch from Cairo. The reasons for the extent of this delay are not clear though local difficulties are known to exist.

6. The smaller component of the total lag, namely the interval between despatch from Cairo to receipt at Caversham, appears reasonable, though it is desirable from the news aspect that it should be reduced if possible. It is understood that there are no delays in teleprinting of material from F.B.I.S. London-F.B.I.S. Caversham.

7. An analysis of the cables shows that short news items do not appear to have any priority in traffic over material of a longer term economic or political intelligence nature.

8. A detailed breakdown of the analysis is given in Appendix B (in one copy only).

MATERIAL FROM F.B.I.S. WASHINGTON

An examination of specimen daily reports and of cables received by F.B.I.S. Washington over a 24-hour period shows:

(a) Soviet Transmissions

Coverage of Soviet regional transmissions in the cables examined was confined to one short item from Khabarovsk. An earlier examination of two issues of the Washington daily report produced no material from Soviet regional stations in the Far East, which would be our main interest. We could usefully take Moscow transmissions in Korean and Japanese, although it should again be stressed that careful selection would be necessary as examples in the Washington cables revealed a certain amount of centrally-produced Moscow material received earlier on the main channels.

(b) Other Far Eastern Material

Here again it is disappointing to find that there is little coverage of local stations and that a high percentage of the material is taken from stations adequately covered here when reception is good. We should, however, find all material from Korea (Pyongyang) and Siam valuable. Other material which would be useful includes: China: Hankow; Chungking in Cantonese (we take the English in Caversham; North Shenai in Mandarin (for comparison with the often imperfectly received English intercepted here); Shanghai. Indochina: Saigon in Vietnamese; the Viet Nam news agency - if it cannot be taken here regularly. Japan: Both Jiji and Kyodo.

(c) Latin America

The main interest in F.B.I.S. coverage of this area is in agency and point-to-point material. It seems unlikely that F.B.I.S. material would add much to what we already receive. Moreover, consumer interest in this is limited.

Conclusions

(a) In general, the content of the F.B.I.S. Washington cables is disappointing in that it adds little of outstanding value to our Caversham coverage. The main value would be to fill in certain minor yet not unimportant gaps in our Editorial and News Services.

(b) A large proportion of the material consists of point to point transmissions, i.e. Reuter, A.P.P., etc., cannot be used by us because of the copyright issue.

(c) A correspondingly large proportion of the material duplicates Caversham monitoring. i.e. New Delhi, Australia, Tass in English for Europe etc.

(d) The quality of the cables, in so far as sub-editing and legibility is concerned would appear to be superior to the Cairo cables.

(e) We have no complete guide to the quality of editing and selection, as in the case of Cairo, where original transcripts were available for comparison.

(f) The Washington daily reports, which are more expertly edited than the Osire product, cover most of but not all the cabled material. They also include a very high percentage of Caversham-monitored material as well as some of the Osire intake.

(g) In the absence of information on the possible time-lag in the receipt of material in Caversham it is not possible to state what use could be made of Far Eastern material by the News Bureau. Both from an Editorial and News Bureau point of view the most careful selection would be essential if both our needs are to be met. From a general coverage angle the requirements of Editorial and News Bureau coincide.

Encs: Tables showing a comparative analysis of Washington and Caversham coverage of Far Eastern and Latin American transmissions are contained in Appendices G and H respectively. Details of F.B.I.S. Far Eastern and Latin American coverage are contained in Appendices E and F respectively.

APPENDIX A

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF BROADCASTS REGULARLY

MONITORED IN CAIRO

(All times GMT)

The following analysis is based on the Cairo Schedule dated 1st January, 1948.

1. BROADCASTS INAUDIBLE AT CAVERSHAM

(a) Balkans

Athens (medium wave broadcasts which are not relayed over short wave)

Salonica

Tirane in Albanian (except as under 4)

(b) Near & Middle East

Baghdad 1500 (only 1900 occasionally audible)

Beirut 1100

Cairo 1230

Damascus 1230

Jerusalem

(c) USSR Regional stations

Alma Ata (occasionally audible)

Ashkhabad (occasionally audible)

Baku

Erivan

Ismail

Kharkov

Kishinev

Poltava

Sumi

2. STATIONS MONITORED AT CAVERSHAM IRREGULARLY, DUE TO FLUCTUATING
RECEPTION CONDITIONS

Radio Romania (Bucharest)

Romania Libera

Sofia

Athens (Greek) 1915 & 2000

- 2 -

3. BROADCASTS MONITORED IN CAVERSHAM AS WELL AS IN CAIRO

(a) Broadcasts covered regularly

Ankara in Turkish 1115

Belgrade in Serbo-Croat 0615 (now 0600)
1630 (no longer exists)
1800
2200

Cairo in Arabic 1830

Damascus in Arabic 1800

Free Greece 0500
1215
1830

Moscow in Arabic 1530
1700

Moscow in Greek 1630
1900
2000

Moscow in Russian 1715
1900

Moscow in Turkish 1800

Sher al-Adna 1600
1830

Tashkent in English 1700

Teheran in English 1210

Tirana in Greek 1815

(b) Broadcasts covered irregularly

Ankara in Turkish 1815

Beirut in Arabic 1700
1800

Damascus 1900

Leningrad 1845

Tunis in Arabic 2025

Moscow in Turkish 1600
1930

4. BROADCASTS AUDIBLE BUT NOT MONITORED AT CAVERSHAM

Ankara in Arabic 1630

Batavia in Arabic 1730 (Batavia well covered in Dutch & English)

Free Indonesia in Arabic 1500 (Batavia well covered in Dutch & English)

Belgrade in Bulgarian 1315 (no interest)

- 3 -

Kiev in Ukrainian (no Ukrainian Monitor)
Moscow in Turkish 1000 (no Turkish Monitor available at this time)
Moscow in Albanian 2000 (no Albanian Monitor)
Paris in Arabic 1615 (Paris in Arabic 1145 or 1200 covered)
Sharq al-Ahna 1630 (Suns.) (not of any real interest)
Teheran in Arabic 1130 (other Teheran coverage sufficient)
Tirana in Albanian for Home & Abroad 1900 (no Albanian Monitor)
2100 " " "

5. BROADCASTS FROM EASTERN EUROPE, THE NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST WHICH ARE NOT MONITORED IN CAVERHAM OR CAIRO

Eastern Europe

Albanian Regional Stations
Bulgarian Regional Stations
Czechoslovak Regional Stations
Greek Regional Stations (other than Salonika)
Hungarian Regional Stations (Budapest II)
Polish Regional Stations
Rumanian Regional Stations
Tchecoslav Regional Stations
U.S.S.R. Regionals (additional coverage)

Near and Middle East

Egypt (Transmissions other than the three covered by Cairo)
Palestine Clandestine Stations
Persian Regionals (except Tabriz)
Saudi Arabia)
) if any broadcasting station exists
Transjordania)
Turkish Regional Stations (if any)
Yemen (Sana'a)

None of the above stations are audible in Caverham, and information is not yet available as to which of them are now audible in Cairo, or will be in Cyprus.

APPENDIX 'C'

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF FAR EASTERN TRANSMISSIONS CONTAINED IN
THE FILE RECEIVED FROM WASHINGTON

A. FOIIR

I BROADCASTS INAUDIBLE AT CAVERSHAM

China	Peking Chungking (only a later bulletin audible) Shanghai North Shensi
Indonesia	Soerakarta Jogjakarta
Korea	Pyeongyang
Philippines	Manila
U.S.S.R.	Khabarovsk

II BROADCASTS REGULARLY MONITORED AT CAVERSHAM

Australia	Melbourne
India	New Delhi
U.S.S.R.	Moscow Home Services

III BROADCASTS AUDIBLE BUT NOT MONITORED AT CAVERSHAM

Indo-China	Saigon in Tonkinese (no Tonkinese Monitor)
Indonesia	Batavia in English (Dutch coverage sufficient)
Malaya	Singapore in English (generally of little interest)
U.S.S.R.	Moscow in Japanese (no Japanese Monitor) Moscow in Korean (no Korean Monitor)

IV FAR EASTERN BROADCASTS NOT MONITORED AT CAVERSHAM OR CONTAINED IN WASHINGTON FILE

U.S.S.R.	Moscow in Mandarin Moscow in Mongolian Moscow in Indonesian Malay Regionals: Vladivostok Yakutsk Ulan Ude Nagadan Petropavlovsk-on-Kamchatka
----------	---

APPENDIX 'D'

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF LATIN AMERICAN TRANSMISSIONS CONTAINED IN THE

FILE RECEIVED FROM WASHINGTON

(All times GMT)

A. VOICE

I BROADCASTS INAUDIBLE AT CAVERSHAM

Argentina	Mendoza 1030
Peru	Lima 0300
Venezuela	Maracaibo 1100
Mexico	XEQQ Mexico 0415 0430 1400

II BROADCASTS REGULARLY MONITORED AT CAVERSHAM

Chile	Santiago 0050
Argentina	Buenos Aires, Radio Splendid 0245 Buenos Aires, Radio El Mundo 0300

III BROADCASTS AUDIBLE BUT NOT MONITORED AT CAVERSHAM

Brazil	Rio de Janeiro in Spanish 0135 (repetitive)
--------	---

B. MORSE

I TRANSMISSIONS INAUDIBLE AT CAVERSHAM

II TRANSMISSIONS MONITORED AT CAVERSHAM

(a) Regularly

Chile	Santiago in Spanish to Embassies
-------	----------------------------------

(b) Irregularly

Argentina	Buenos Aires in Spanish for Embassies
-----------	---------------------------------------

III TRANSMISSIONS AUDIBLE BUT NOT MONITORED AT CAVERSHAM

Brazil	Rio, ASA, in Portuguese for Brazil
--------	------------------------------------

IV TRANSMISSIONS WHICH DO NOT COME WITHIN OUR PRESENT COVERAGE MANDATE

Argentina	Buenos Aires, Talam, in Spanish for Daily "Cuyo" in San Juan, Argentina
Colombia	UP from Bogota for New York & S.American capitals
Mexico	XEH Mexico, D.F., Pue, for specified Mexican newspapers

B. WORLD

I TRANSMISSIONS INAUDIBLE AT CAVERSHAM

China	Nanking: Central News in English Central News in Chinese Numerical Code U.P. from Nanking
Indo-China	Viet Nam News Agency in English
Philippines	U.P. from Manila
U.S.S.R.	Russian for all stations and ships at sea.

II TRANSMISSIONS REGULARLY MONITORED AT CAVERSHAM

China	North Shenai English Morse U.P. from Shanghai
Japan	Central News Tokyo to Nanking

III TRANSMISSIONS AUDIBLE BUT NOT MONITORED AT CAVERSHAM

Indonesia	ANETA in English (sufficient other coverage)
U.S.S.R.	Tass for Europe (generally not of sufficient Tass for N. America interest to warrant coverage, but but laid on when a big story is breaking)

IV TRANSMISSIONS WHICH DO NOT COME WITHIN OUR PRESENT COVERAGE MANDATE

Central News from Sydney to Shanghai

Central News from Moscow to Nanking

NewsNews Chronicle from Rangoon to London

Reuters from Shanghai to all Reuter stations
Reuters from Tokyo
Reuters from Bangkok to Singapore

A.P. from Nanking
A.P. from Manila

Tass from Shanghai to Moscow
Tass from Irkutsk to Shanghai

AFP from Saigon
AFP from Tokyo

G. RELEASES

Japan

The question of coverage at Caversham of the
Kyodo and Jiji releases in Tokyo does not arise.

All times EST

APPENDIX 'K'F.B.I.-S. FAR EASTERN COVERAGEWASHINGTON FILE**AUSTRALIA**

Melbourne	0230	25.2
	0400	
	0800	

Morse Despatch from Sydney for Central News Shanghai

0244	25.2
------	------

BURMA

Morse Despatch from Rangoon to News Chronicle London

0313	25.2
0315	

CHINA

I	Hanking in Cantonese	0640	25.2
	" " Japanese	0710	
	" " English	0440	24.2
	" " "	0530	
	" " "	0440	25.2
	" " "	0500	
	" " "	0530	
	Chungking in Cantonese	0530	24.2
	" " "	0635	25.2
	" " English	0700	
	Shanghai in English	0500	25.2
	North Shenai in Mandarin	0600	25.2

II	Hanking Central News English		
	Morse	0127	25.2
		0130	
		0315	
		0415	
		0430	
		0825	
		0840	
		0850	
		0945	
	Hanking Central News		
	Chinese		
	Numeral Code	0716	24.2
		0720	
		0722	
	North Shenai English		
	Morse	0830	25.2
		0845	
		0900	
		0915	
		0930	

III	Morse Reuters from		
	Shanghai	1930	24.2
		1938	
		1948	
		0530	25.2
		0540	
		0602	
		0610	
		0615	

Appendix E

CHINA (cont'd)

III Morse for Reuters Hongkong	0744	25.2
Morse UP from Shanghai	2005	24.2
	2030	
	2035	
	2042	
	2047	
	0630	25.2
Morse UP from Hanking	0430	25.2
Morse AP from Hanking	0500	25.2
Morse Tass from Shanghai for Moscow	0107	25.2
	0112	
	0117	
	0256	
	0257	
Morse (French) AFP from Hanking to Paris	0440	25.2

GREAT BRITAIN

NBC Russian	1145	25.2
	1445	

INDIA

New Delhi in English	1030	24.2
	2230	
	0030	25.2
	0730	
	0930	
	1030	

INDOCHINA

Saigon in Tonkinese	0645	24.2
AFP French Morse from Saigon	0615	24.2
	0615	25.2
Viet Nam New Agency English Morse	0800	25.2

INDONESIA

Batavia in English	0515	25.2
	0930	
ANETA in English Morse	0635	25.2
Soerakarta in Indonesian	0630	24.2
Jogjakarta in Indonesian	0700	24.2
	0715	
	0730	

Appendix E

JAPAN

Tokyo: Kyodo Release in Japanese	0700	24.2
" " " " & Eng.	2000	
" " " " " "	2100	
" " " " " "	7 30 a.m.	25.2
	7 15 a.m.	
Tokyo: Jiji Release in Japanese	1900	23.2
" " " " " "	2100	24.2
" " " " & Eng.	7 20 a.m.	25.2
" " " " " "	0200	25.2
" " " " " "	0500	
" " " " " "	1900	
Morse Central News from Tokyo Banking	12.58	24.2
	1925	
	1940	
	2130	
	2220	
	0100	25.2
	0105	
	0340	
	0350	
	0359	
	0635	
	0655	
	1230	
	1255	
Morse AFP from Tokyo in English	0440	25.2
Morse Reuters	2130	
	2141	
	2150	
	2153	
	0510	25.2

KOREA

Pyongyang	0845	21.2
	0700	22.2
	0730	
	0603	24.2
	0700	
	0816	
	0500	25.2
	0700	
	0815	

MALAYSIA

Singapore English	0915	25.2
-------------------	------	------

PHILIPPINES

Manila in English	0700	24.2
Morse UP from Manila	0830	25.2
Morse AP " "	2005	24.2
	2014	
	2022	
	0530	25.2

Appendix E

SIAM

Morse Despatch from Bangkok for Reuters in Singapore	0645	25.2
---	------	------

USCR

I Voices:

(a) Home Service

Moscow	2300	24.2
	1100	25.2
	1118	
	1201	
	1245	
	1530	

(b) Home: Far Eastern Service

Moscow	0430	25.2
	0540	
	0730	
	1730	

(c) Home: Western Asian Service

Moscow	2000	25.2
	2100	

(d) Regional Transmission

Khabarovsk	0715	25.2
------------	------	------

(e) Far Eastern Service

Moscow in Japanese	0230	25.2
	0400	
	0700	
	0845	

Moscow in Korean	0330	25.2
	0630	

II Morse:

Tass for Europe	2216	24.2
	2221	
	2223	
	2247	
	2251	
	2303	
	2312	
	2316	
	2320	
	2329	
	2345	
	0115	25.2
	1213	
	1235	
	1905	
	1954	
	2023	
	2044	
	2049	
	2057	

Appendix I

USSR

II Morse: (Continued)

Tass for Europe	2115	25.2
	2141	
	2143	
	2145	
	2154	
	2200	
	2201	
	2214	
	2233	
Tass for N. America	1820	24.2
	1600	25.2
	1642	
	1704	
	1711	
	1732	
	1745	
	1800	
	1807	
	1817	

III Morse Despatches:

English Morse from Irkutsk to Shanghai	1829	23.2
	2007	24.2
	2120	
Russian Morse to All Stations & Ships at Sea	0715	24.2
English Morse Central News Moscow to Hanking	2141	23.2

LOGS

Portland File
East Coast File
Hawaii File
Tokyo File

All Times EST

APPENDIX IF.B.I.-S. LATIN AMERICAN COVERAGEI Voice**ARGENTINA**

Buenos Aires	2145	24.2 (5)
	2200	(3)

Mendoza	0530	25.2 (5)
---------	------	----------

BRAZIL

Rio de Janeiro	2055	25.2 (1)
" " " in Spanish	2035	(1)

CHILE

Santiago	1950	24.2 (3)
----------	------	----------

GUATEMALA

Guatemala City	2030 (inaudible)	24.2
----------------	------------------	------

PERU

Lima	2200	24.2 (2)
------	------	----------

VENEZUELA

Maracaibo	0600	24.2 (2)
-----------	------	----------

MEXICO

XEQQ Mexico D.F.	2315	24.2 (7)
	2330	(10)
	0900	25.2 (10)

Note: Figures in brackets represent the number of items taken from each bulletin.

II Morse**ARGENTINA**

Buenos Aires in Spanish Morse for Embassies Abroad

1930	25.2
------	------

Buenos Aires, Telam, in Spanish Morse for Daily "Cuyo"
in San Juan, Argentina

2016	24.2
2020	
2025	

Appendix F

ARGENTINA

Buenos Aires, Telen, in Spanish Morse etc. (Cont'd)

2033	24.2
2035	
2155	25.2

BRASIL

Rio de Janeiro, ASA Press, in Portuguese Morse to
Brasil

1830	24.2
1839	

CHILE

Santiago in Spanish Morse to Embassies

1000	25.2
------	------

COLOMBIA

Bogota: U.P. in Spanish Morse to New York and S. American
capitals

1901	24.2
1803	
1806	
1811	
1822	

MEXICO

XNH Mexico, D.F., Pua, in Spanish Morse for specified
Mexican Newspapers

1008	24.2
1058	
1105	
1108	
1115	
1122	
1133	
1136	
1201	
1205	
1215	
1220	